



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,455	12/31/2003	Michael Swafford	50037.0237US01	4974
27488 7590 06/07/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER RUTZ, JARED IAN	
			ART UNIT 2187	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/750,455	Applicant(s) SWAFFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner Jared I. Rutz	Art Unit 2187	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jared I. Rutz. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Frank J. Bozzo (Reg. No. 36,756). (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Robertson et al., Gupta.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant initiated interview to discuss proposed amendments.

With respect to the rejection of claims 11-18, 20, and 32 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and 35 USC 101, Applicant proposed amendments to more clearly show that claim 11 is directed to a computer storage media storing computer readable instructions. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment would be sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 11-18, 20, and 32 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and 35 USC 101 presented in the Office action of 3/21/2007.

With respect to the rejection of claims 11-18, 20, and 32 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Voight, Applicant proposed amendments to positively recite that the claimed computer storage media stores the recited computer readable instructions. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments would be sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 11-18, 20, and 32 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Voight presented in the Office action of 3/21/2007.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, and 31-32 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Robertson, Applicant proposed amendments to more clearly define differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record. The Examiner suggested alternative wording to more clearly define the desired limitations. However, the Examiner indicated that more search and consideration would be required to determine patentability of the claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 10, 20, 21-29, and 33 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Gupta, Applicant proposed amendments to more clearly define differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated that it was unclear if the specification as originally filed would support the new claims. Further proposed amendments were discussed, and the Examiner indicated that further search and consideration would be required to determine patentability of the claims.

JIR

Brian R. Peugh  
Primary Examiner

6/6/07